

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see Form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

2 MAR 2005

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see Form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/002365	International filing date (day/month/year) 08.03.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 09.04.2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L29/12		
Applicant SIEMENS AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1 (a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires earlier.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA  European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Netherlands Tel.: + 31 70 340-2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax.: + 31 70 340-3016	Authorized officer Olmos, J Tel. +31 70 340-4065	
--	--	---

Box No. I. Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - contained in the international application as filed
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II. Priority

1. The following document has not yet been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Inventive Step	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Industrial Applicability	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Independent claim 1 meets the requirements regarding novelty and inventive step for the following reasons:

- 1.1 The document D1 = US 6,735,692 is regarded as the closest prior art to the subject matter of claim 1. D1 discloses all of the features of claim 1:

A method for configuring a device in a data network, where in step a) a subnetwork address is stored in the device (column 2, lines 53-59; column 3, lines 15-23), in step b) the device transmits a request message to an addressing server (column 3, lines 15-18), in step c) the addressing server transmits address information from parameter servers to the device in response to the request message (column 3, lines 18-21), in step d) the device uses the address information to set up a connection to the parameter server, and in step d) the parameter server uses this connection to transmit to the device parameters which are used to configure the device (column 3, lines 20-32).

- 1.2 The object to be achieved is **transmission of fewer data**.

- 1.3 To achieve the object which is set, claim 1 indicates the following additional features: a request message comprising the domain name is set up; address information from a parameter server associated with this device is transmitted.

- 1.4 In D1, the addressing server transmits to the device address information from **parameter servers in all subnetworks**. The device then selects the parameter server in its subnetwork (column 3, lines 18-23). In the solution in claim 1, to transmit fewer data, the parameter server is selected in the addressing server and not in the apparatus, as is the case in D1.

In addition, claim 1 also indicates the following additional features: a domain name is stored in the device; and the addressing server is used to convert between domain names and the Internet addresses associated therewith.

Instead of a domain name, D1 stores a subnetwork address in the device (column 2, line 58). These additional features achieve the further technical object of **simplifying the configuration of devices**, because if the IP address space of the subnetwork were to be altered the device would not require any further configuration, whereas, in D1, if the device should request the new subnetwork address the configuration would not be produced correctly in this case. It is generally known that domain names are frequently more permanent than subnetwork addresses. For this reason, the solution in D1 requires more configuration work than the solution in claim 1.

- 1.5 For this reason, if the person skilled in the art took into account the fact that, to transmit fewer data, it would be an **ordinary measure** to perform a given function at the location of the required data (to transmit the subnetwork address to the addressing server and to make the decision there), it is pointed out that the solution in claim 1 also **simplifies the configuration of devices**, because in D1 the configuration of devices would be more complicated and more laborious.

The person skilled in the art therefore takes into account the fact that independent claim 1 meets the requirements regarding novelty and inventive step.

2. Independent **claim 10** also meets the requirements regarding novelty and inventive step, because the arrangement claimed corresponds to the method from claim 1.
3. Independent **claims 2-9 and 11-16** specify further features and thus also meet the requirements regarding novelty and inventive step.